

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/626,785	07/24/2003	Michael Lebner	0156-2006US01 1187		
7590 04/21/2005		EXAMINER			
Kevin M. Farrell			PANTUCK, BRADFORD C		
Pierce Atwood			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Suite 350			ART CIVIT	TATER NUMBER	
One New Hampshire Avenue			3731		
Portsmouth, NH 03801			DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

:						
		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/626,	10/626,785 LEBNER, MICHAEL			
	Office Action Summary	Examin	er	Art Unit		
		Bradford	I C Pantuck	3731		
Doring 6	The MAILING DATE of this commu	nication appears on t	he cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any earn	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com e period for reply specified above is less than thirty ( D period for reply is specified above, the maximum s ure to reply within the set or extended period for repl reply received by the Office later than three months ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ominication. 30) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and y will, by statute, cause the a	event, however, may a reply be t atutory minimum of thirty (30) da will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron oplication to become ABANDON	imely filed  ys will be considered timely.  in the mailing date of this communication.  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
1) 🖂	·					
'=	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action is				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-18 is/a Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-13 and 19-32 is/are rejected Claim(s) 33 and 34 is/are objected Claim(s) are subject to restrict.	re withdrawn from c cted. to.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objected that any objected that any objected that of declaration is objected to be specified to by the specified to be specified t	e: a) accepted or lection to the drawing(s g the correction is requ	) be held in abeyance. S aired if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
· a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internations  See the attached detailed Office actions.	y documents have be y documents have be s of the priority docur onal Bureau (PCT R	een received. een received in Applica ments have been recei ule 17.2(a)).	ntion No ved in this National Stage		
Attachmei	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) 🔲 Interview Summa			
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/31/2003.</li> </ul>			Paper No(s)/Mail			

#### DETAILED ACTION

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-13 and 19-34, drawn to a two component device for closing a wound, classified in class 606, subclass 213.
- II. Claims 14-18, drawn to a liner system having a liner and a tab, classified in class602, subclass 41.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention II has separate utility such as providing easy removal of the liner on a sticker used for decorative purposes. Invention II could also provide easy removal of the liner on tape used for non-surgical purposes, such as tape used in the plumbing art. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Group I, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

2. During a telephone conversation with Kevin Farrell on February 12, 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-13 and 19-34. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office

Art Unit: 3731

action. Claims 14-18 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1-13 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 19 each recites the limitation "the wound edge" in line 10 and lines 12-13 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-13 and 19-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,329,564 B1 to Lebner in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,979,450 to Baker et al. Regarding Claims 1, 9, 19, 27each of Lebner's anchoring members (5 and 25) have adhesive for sticking to the skin [column 5, lines 45-54; Fig. 3] and connecting members (15 and 35) extending therefrom. "Protective film" is attached to adhesive backed surface of the each anchoring member [column 6, lines 13-15]. Lebner does not disclose a semi rigid tab as set forth in claims 1 or 19.

Application/Control Number: 10/626,785

Art Unit: 3731

However, Baker discloses a very similar polymer wound dressing with adhesive for application to skin adjacent an incision [column 1, lines 26-30 and lines 44-46]. Baker teaches a "relatively stiff" handle (22) protruding from the edge of "flexible" film (16) [column 8, lines 45-49]. The flexible film/"liner" (16) covers the adhesive (14). Baker explains that in this art often when applying a polymer wound dressing "drape", because of the flimsy nature of the materials used often the polymer becomes wrinkled during the application process and such a shoddy application "may not prevent bacteria on the skin from getting into the wound" [column 2 lines 8-20 and 27-31]. He teaches having a handle—both on the "drape" and on the release liner (16) in order to allow quick, easy, and wrinkle free application of an adhesive backed wound covering [see also Fig. 1A – Fig. 1C]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lebner's wound closure device to have handles—both on the drape part and on the release liner part—in order to allow one surgeon to rapidly and cleanly apply the wound closure device, as taught by Baker. Such handles would extend past the wound edge, as shown in Baker's Fig. 1A.

Regarding Applicant's limitation that the tab extends "beyond the wound edge,"

[emphasis added by Examiner] Examiner considers it a matter of obvious design choice which edge of anchoring member (5) [left, right, upper, or lower in Fig. 3 of Lebner] tab (22) extends beyond. As long as the tab extends beyond one of the edges, allowing the user to easily flip the tab with their finger, it would not matter which side the tab is located.

Therefore, the user could choose the wound edge.

5. Regarding Claims 2, 4, 20, and 22, the applied prior art reference would meet claim 1 if it had merely one connecting member (37). However, Fig. 3 shows each component (5 or

Application/Control Number: 10/626,785 Page 5

Art Unit: 3731

25) having three connecting members (35 or 15) connected thereto. Therefore, for example, one of the *second* or *third connecting members* (35) could be called a "pulling element."

Such a pulling element is attached to the adjacent connecting member via the first/second component.

Alternatively, elements (40 and 45) can be considered pulling elements [column 6, lines 1-10]. These pulling elements are removable along serrated lines (17) and are shaped differently than the anchoring members.

- 6. Regarding Claims 8 and 26, Lebner discloses making his two-part connector out of an elastic polymeric material reinforced with mesh (for example). Such a spongy, sieve-like material would certainly be capable of having vapor (water particles) pass through it.
- Regarding Claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28-30, and 32, in column 9 line 66 to column 10 line 10, Baker teaches that one film handle may "be of a distinct color, pattern, or have some other feature distinguishing characteristic that would distinguish one handle from the other."
- 8. Regarding Claims 13 and 31, Lebner's release liner is capable of being creased, folded, or bent.

### Allowable Subject Matter

9 Claims 33 and 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/626,785

Art Unit: 3731

#### Conclusion

- 10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  - U.S. Patent No. 6,495,230 to do Canto
  - U.S. Patent No. 4,646,731 to Brower
  - U.S. Patent No. 2,762,371 to Guio

Publication No. 2004/0204740 to Weiser

- U.S. Patent No. 4,753,232 to Ward
- U.S. Patent No. 4,926,850 to Lott
- U.S. Patent No. 5,135,518 to Vera
- U.S. Patent No. 5,733,251 to Johns

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradford C Pantuck whose telephone number is (571) 272-4701. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Page 7

Application/Control Number: 10/626,785

Art Unit: 3731

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BCP April 18, 2005 GLENN K. DAWSON PRIMARY EXAMINER